



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II. — The Etymology of Sanskrit *Punya-*

BY DR. TRUMAN MICHELSON

NEW YORK CITY

THE accepted etymology of Sanskrit *punya-* is that it is a Middle-Indic loan-word, and stands for **pr̥nya-* (cf. Wackernagel, *AiGr.* I, pp. 21, 192),¹ and so is to be connected with the root *pr̥* ('fill'). This derivation meets an obstacle in the dialect of the inscriptions of Asoka, as Gīrnār *puññam* cannot phonetically come from such a prototype.² For *ny* be-

¹ This explanation has been accepted by Charpentier (*ZvergSp.* XL, 439), Bartholomae (ib. XLI, 329), and Meillet (*Album-Kern*, 122). Uhlenbeck remarks in his *Etymological Dictionary* "nicht genügend erklärt," but says nothing to justify his scepticism, and it has been hitherto disregarded.

² The correspondents in the other versions of the Fourteen-Edicts are practically of no value in this connection. For in the dialect of the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra versions *ny* and *ṇy* fall together in *ññ* (written *mñ* and *ñ*); and in the dialects of the 'Māgadhan' versions *nn* (written *mnn*) corresponds to Sanskrit *ny* and *ṇy* alike. Cf. Shb. *amñātra*, Shb., Mans. *añātra* (Skt. *anyatra*); Shb. *[h]i[ra]ñā-*; Mans. *hiñā-* (read *hirañā-*) (Skt. *hiranya-*); Kālsī *amna-* (Skt. *anya-*); *hilaṃna-* (Skt. *hiranya-*). The vocalism of the Gīrnār and 'Māgadhan' versions has no bearing whatsoever on the point at issue; nor is that of the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra correspondent (*puññam*) in any sense decisive. On the history of Indic *ṛ* in the dialect of the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra recensions of the Fourteen-Edicts of Asoka, see *AJP.* xxx, 420 f. and xxxi, 55 f. There I have shown that the correspondent to Indic *ṛ* after labials is *ur*, otherwise *ir*; and that where we have plain *u* this either does not wholly represent the native product (*vapuṭa* for **vaputra*, i.e. *vapurta*) or else is an ordinary 'Māgadhim' (-*paripucha*). If the Indic prototype was **pr̥ṇyam*, it would be possible to assume that this became **pur̥nyam*, then **punya-*, and finally *puññam* (Shb., Mans. *puññam*). That is, *r* was assimilated to the following *ṇ* because it also was a lingual consonant, just as I have shown (see *AJP.* xxx, 289, and *JAOS.* xxx, 89) that, contrary to the opinion of Johansson, it is likely that *r* was assimilated to *ṣ* (a lingual consonant!) in the combinations *ārṣ* and *ārṣy*. As a further support for the view that *r* is assimilated to an immediately following *ṇ* in the dialect of Shb. and Mans., we have Mans. *bapaṇi*; this stands for *Tabapaṇi*, i.e. *Tambapaṇi* or *Tambapaṇi*, for anusvāras are frequently graphically omitted and *ṇ*, as well as *mṇ*, can stand for *ṇṇ* on inscriptions. The Sanskrit equivalent is *Tāmraparṇī*. If Mans. *Tambapaṇi* of the German edition be right (there is no devanāgarī transcript to confirm it), and *Tambapaṇi* of the ed. in *Epigraphia Indica* a misprint, it can also be used for this purpose. But it should be frankly admitted that these forms leave much to be desired in the way of cer-

comes *ṇṇ* (written *m̐ṇ*)¹ in this dialect; e.g. *ānaṇṇaṇṇam* (Skt. *ānṛṇyam*), *hiraṇṇa-* (Skt. *hiranya-*).

One is apt, on the strength of this, to rashly jump to the conclusion that the accepted etymology of Sanskrit *puṇya-* must be a mistaken one. It will at once be said that Gīrnār *puṇṇāṇṇam* points unmistakably to an Indic prototype, **puṇyam*, as *ṇy* becomes *ṇṇ* (written *m̐ṇ* and *ṇ*) in our dialect; cf. *aṇṇa-*, *aṇṇatra* (Skt. *anya-*, *anyatra*). Accordingly it will be urged that Skt. *puṇyam* must also come from this,² and *nīṇya-* may

taintly. I have recently shown (*IF*. xxiv, 55) that the *m̐n* of Shb. *Taṇḇapaṇṇi* and *Taṇḇapaṇṇiya* is a 'Māgadhism,' as is admittedly the *m̐b* of all the cited forms. So that the Mansehra forms might be also due to such influence, especially if Mans. *Taṇḇapaṇṇiya* be the true reading. In that case the lingual *ṇ* of *ḇapaṇi* (i.e. *Ṭapaṇi*) would be the sole trace of the true native word. And it should be noticed that 'Māgadhisms' are especially frequent in the names of peoples and countries. Examples are Shb., Mans. *Pitenika-* and Mans. *Āmdha-*; see Michelson, *IF*. xxiv, 54 f. Shb. and Mans. *anaṇṇiyaṇṇam* is a partial 'Māgadhism of the same type as Mans. *kayaṇa-* (for *kalāṇa-*, which is found in both Mans. and Shb., influenced by 'Māgadhan' *kayāna-*) and so cannot be used as evidence one way or the other. The same applies to Shb., Mans. *gaṇṇana-*; see *AJP*. xxx, 423. In this connection I may say that I still hold that *r* is not assimilated to immediately following original dental stops, nor are such stops thereby converted into linguals in the true native words of Shb. and Mans. This applies not only to *r* when the correspondent to Indic *r*, but also to *r* in the combinations *ir* and *ur* when these come from Indic vocalic *ṛ*. Neither Ālī nor the various Prākṛit dialects have any bearing whatsoever on the point at issue. For *ṇy* and *ṇy* fall together in them, yielding Pāli *ṇṇ*, ordinary Pkt. *ṇṇ* (*nn* also in AMg., JM., JS'), Mg., P., CP. *ṇṇ*; compare Pischel, *Grammatik*, § 282; and Indic *ṛ* after a labial falls together with Indic *u* (giving *u*) in all of them. [This last is a trifle too sweeping, as the two are kept apart even after labials under special circumstances, but the above rule is the one ordinarily given, and applies in the vast majority of cases.] For this reason Pāli *puṇṇāṇṇam*, etc., must be left out of the present discussion. For the cases in which *ṇṇ* (written *ṇ*) is found in the Mansehra version for earlier *ṇy* and *ṇy* alike — in place of ordinary (and Shb.) *ṇṇ* — see my 'Interrelation of the Dialects of the Fourteen-Edicts of Asoka,' to appear in *JAOS*. xxx, 87. Franke, in his *Pāli und Sanskrit*, does not explain the doublets. In view of what has been said about Prākṛit, one is tempted to regard the forms with *ṇṇ* as due to dialect mixture. But the matter is wholly uncertain.

¹ It should be remembered that *m̐* is used very slovenly for any nasal before consonants, exactly as in modern Indian editions of Sanskrit texts; and on inscriptions *ṇ* can stand for *ṇṇ*, *ṇ* for *ṇṇ*, *m̐* for *mm̐*, exactly as *s* for *ss*, etc.; see Bühler, *Epigraphia Indica*, II, 91, and Michelson, *IF*. xxiii, 252.

² For the phonetic reasons stated above, the correspondents to Gīrnār *puṇṇāṇṇam* in the dialects of the other versions of the Fourteen-Edicts can be disregarded.

be offered as a parallel phonetic development. But the ordinary view (see Uhlenbeck, s. v.) that *nīnya-* is connected with *nī* is wholly erroneous. As Meillet has shown (*Album-Kern*, 121 ff.; see also Bartholomae, *ZvergSp.* xli, 329), *nīnya-* is for **nīnya-* and is a Middle-Indic loan-word. Thus, so far from being evidence of the derivation of *punya-* from **pīnya-*, it has become one of the most cogent proofs in favor of this very derivation.

Admitting, then, that the accepted etymology of Sanskrit *punya-* is correct, a way must be found to harmonize the phonetic difficulty of Gīrnār *pumñam* with it.

The first solution that one might be tempted to offer would be as follows: In the 'Māgadhan' dialects we have dental *n* as the correspondent to Sanskrit lingual *ṇ*; and *nn* (written *nn*) corresponds to Sanskrit *ny* and *ṇy* alike, e.g. Kālsī *aṇna-*, *hilaṇna-* (Skt. *anya-*, *hiranya-*). So Kālsī *pumñam* could correspond exactly to a Sanskrit **pṇyam* (*pūnyam*). The immediate precursor of Kālsī *pumñam* necessarily would be **pūnyam*. Now Gīrnār *pumñam* (and similarly Shb. and Mans. *puñam*) might be a 'Māgadhan' loan-word borrowed in this stage of development; and hence we have the regular conversion of *ny* to *ññ* (written *nn*) in the Gīrnār word. Phonetically this hypothesis is not impeachable, but an incontrovertible argument still remains to show the utter falsity of this view, namely, there are no other 'Māgadhan' loan-words in the dialect of the Gīrnār redaction nor in the dialect (for their speech is essentially one) of the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra versions. It will be understood that I do not refer to such 'Māgadhisms' as are only traces of the dialect of the 'Māgadhan' original, of which the Gīrnār, Shāhbāzgarhi, and Mansehra recensions are translations. For these have no place in the spoken language of the local vernaculars, and are only literary fictions.¹

Of course *ṇ* for *n* is common enough in Sanskrit words borrowed from the Middle-Indic vernaculars; but there are no other cases where *ṇy* is found for *ny*; if there were, we should certainly derive Skt. *pūnya-* from Indic **pūnya-*, thereby doing away with the complicated and problematic solution offered here. If a prototype **pūnya-* were accepted, we should connect it with the root *pū*.

¹ In my 'Interrelation of the Dialects of the Fourteen-Edicts of Asoka,'

I know but one hypothesis that in some measure will meet the requirements. That it is venturesome, I readily admit, but it at least is possible and has a certain amount of probability. In Sanskrit there are a number of cases in which *n* has been analogically extended at the expense of *ṇ*. Contrast Vedic *tyṇnoti* with Sanskrit *tyṇnoti*, Skt. *prāṇnoti* with Pāli *pāṇnoti*, *paṇuṇāti*, Gīrnār *prāṇuṇāti*, Shāhbāzgarhi *prapūnāti*; observe also Skt. *kṣubhnoti* for **kṣubhnoti*; and further, Skt. *kṣepnu-* beside *kṣepnā-*. See Wackernagel, *AltGr.* I, § 168, Thumb, *Handbuch*, § 83, Michelson, *IF.* xxiv, 54. The same thing is to be observed in the dialects of the Asokan inscriptions. In the dialects of the Gīrnār, Shāhbāzgarhi, and Mansehra recensions of the Fourteen-Edicts *n* is everywhere used where we phonetically should expect *ṇ* in case-endings; see Johansson, *Shb.* I, 166 (52 of the reprint), Michelson, *AJP.* xxx, 422, 423, *JAOS.* xxx, 87.¹ Examples are: G.,

JAOS. xxx, 77-93, I was not prepared to substantiate this sweeping assertion if need be; so I have there expressed myself more cautiously, but the further I have investigated this matter, the more convinced I am of the position taken in the present paper. It may be suggested that Gīrnār *puṇṇām* is a loan-word from some Indic dialect other than 'Māgadhan.' But up to the present time no such loan-words have been pointed out in this dialect. In fact, there is only one word which at all need be taken into consideration, to wit, *kalāṇa-*. But as correspondents we have Sanskrit *kalyāṇa-*, Pāli *kallāṇa-*, *kalyāṇa-* (dialectic doublets), Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra *kalāṇa-*. So any explanation of the Gīrnār word must satisfy the requirements of the other languages, as I have said before (*IF.* xxiv, 54). Thus far nothing has been suggested that will meet all the requirements; and so G. *kalāṇa-* is altogether too doubtful a quantity to be used in explaining *puṇṇām*.

¹ The same thing has happened in Pāli, but the phonetics of that language do not permit us to bring it into correlation with the phenomenon in G., Shb., and Mans. with absolute certainty in the majority of cases. For example, Pāli *piyena* and *puttena* correspond to G., Shb., Mans. *priyena* and *putrena* respectively. But it is impossible to determine whether Indic **priyena* and **putrena* (Skt. *priyena* and *putrena*) were replaced by **priyena* and **putrena*, and then these phonetically became *piyena* and *puttena*; or whether Indic **priyena* and **putrena* phonetically became **piyena* and **puttena*, and only subsequently **piyena* and **puttena* were replaced by *piyena* and *puttena* respectively. The process in either case is the same; the chronology of the phenomenon is alone debatable. Owing to the phonetics of the various Prākṛit languages we can get no evidence from them to bear on this point. [On revision I note that Pāli *piyena* and *puttena* do not chance to be given by Childers in his Dictionary; yet such

Shb., Mans. *priyena*, *putrena*, G. *parākramena*, Shb. and Mans. *parakramena*; G. *prāṇasatasahasrāṇi*, Shb. *pra[ṇa-satasa]has[r]ani*, Mans. *praṇaśa[taśa]hasrani*; G. *Gamdhārānaṁ*, Shb. *Gamdharanaṁ*, Mans. *Ga[ni]dharanaṁ*; G. *paśumanuśanaṁ*, Shb. *paśumanuśanaṁ*, Mans. *paśum[a]nuśana*; Shb. *mahamatranam* (per contra note Sanskrit *priyena*, *putrena*, *parākrameṇa*, *prāṇasatasahasrāṇi*, *Gāndhārānām*, *paśumanuśyānām*, *mahāmātrānām* — all with lingual *ṇ*). And in the Shb. dialect we have *n* for *ṇ* a couple of times in suffixes, namely, *chamanaye* (Skt. **kṣamaṇaye*) and *aviprahino* (Skt. *aviprahīṇas*).¹ Mans. has *aviprahi[ne]* (with 'Māga-

forms must have existed, as is shown by *rūpena* (Skt. *rūpeṇa*), *sakkena* (Skt. *śakreṇa*), *ariyena* (Skt. *āryeṇa*), *mattena* (Skt. *mātreṇa*), *dhammena* (Skt. *dharmaṇa*), *kaṁmanā* (Skt. *karmaṇā*), *sahassāni* (Skt. *sahasrāṇi*). Note especially analogical *n* in the suffixes of *oropana-* (Skt. *avaropāṇa-*), *rosana-* (Skt. *roṣaṇa-*), *savana-* (Skt. *śravaṇa-*), *kubbāna-* (Skt. *kurvāṇa-*), *nibbāna-* (Skt. *nīrvāṇa-*).] (Note *deva-puttena*, D. XXI, 1, 11 ed. PTS.) According to Wackernagel, the dental *n* of *kṣepnu-* is not analogical but phonetic. But I ask how then does he explain the lingual *ṇ* of *kṣepṇā-*? For if *kṣepnu-* were phonetic, then we should expect **kṣepṇā-* and not *kṣepṇā-*. And it is not possible to explain the lingual *ṇ* by analogy; but nothing is easier than to explain the dental *n* of *kṣepnu-* by analogy. And it should be observed that Vedic *tr̥pṇoti*, Pāli *pāpūṇoti*, Gīṛnār *prāpūṇati*, Shāhbāzgarhi *prapūṇati* show that the conversion of *n* to *ṇ* by ordinary rules is not prevented in the combination *-pn-*.

¹ Shb. *aviprahino* is not to be judged wholly in the same way as *chamanaye*; they both have analogical *n* in the suffix, but *aviprahino* derives its *n* from the uncompounded **hino*. Cf. Skt. *paripāna-* beside phonetic *suprapāṇa-*, *paryuhyamāna-* beside *prohyamāna-* (both from the 'root' *vah*), *parāhna-* beside *pūr-vāhna-*, *aparāhṇa-* (Wackernagel's alternative explanation of this last does not convince me). On the other hand *chamanaye* is due to 'external grammatical analogy.' But the underlying principle, namely, the spread of *n* at the expense of *ṇ*, is the same in both cases. On the *n*-cases of *u*-stems to which original *ṛ*-stems have been transformed in the dialect of Shb. and Mans. (likewise Pāli), see Michelson, *AJP.* xxxi, 61. Shb. *Tambapaṇni*, *Tambapaṇniya*, and Shb., Mans. *Pitenika-* have 'Māgadhan' *n* for native *ṇ*: see Michelson, *IF.* xxiv, 55; and it is far more probable that Shb. *pranatika* also is to be judged the same way from the evidence of Mansehra *panatika*, rather than to be explained by analogy; see Michelson, *AJP.* l.c. (Mans. *Tambapaṇniya* is not certain as the text in *ZDMG.* xlii, has a lingual *ṇ*: hence the form with dental *n* in *El.* ii, may be a mere misprint). Shb. *ka[lanam]* with dental *n* disappears in Bühler's ed. in *El.* ii, and is replaced by *ka[lanam]*. The form *ka[lanam]* in the German ed. is only a misprint, as is shown by the devanāgarī transcript; the same error occurs a couple of times in B's comments in the German ed. I follow Bühler in considering Shb. *-garana* to be a mere blunder for **garaha*. But it

dhan' -e for -o) corresponding to Shb. *aviprahino*; but has a lacuna in the passage corresponding to *chamanaye*. The Girnār text differs slightly in the wording of the corresponding passage, and has a lacuna where we would otherwise find a correspondent to *aviprahino*. We may therefore infer that the dialect of Mans. agreed with that of Shb. in this particular, as it is agreed that the speech of both is essentially the same; there is also a considerable amount of probability that the dialect of the Girnār redaction agreed with them, as it agrees with them in replacing *ṇ* by *n* in case-endings; moreover, these dialects show a considerable number of special points of contact; see *AJP.* xxx, 291, *JAOS.* xxx, 87-89.¹ The bearing the above has in solving our problem

might be one for *-*garahana*, in which case we should assume an analogical extension of dental *n*.

¹ Another argument to show the plausibility of assuming analogical *n* for phonetic *ṇ* in suffixes in the dialect of Girnār in the absence of any direct evidence, is the fact that this is found in Pāli (though not invariably). And there are some very striking agreements between the two as contrasted with the other dialects of the Fourteen-Edicts of Asoka.

For example, *dh* is retained in *idha*; *hm* becomes *mh*; *-smi* becomes *-mhi*; *kata-* corresponds to Skt. *kṛta-*; *-āya* as the dat. sing. of *a*-stems and as the 'oblique' cases of *ā*-stems; *-āyaṃ* as the loc. sing. of *ā*-stems; *r*-endings in verbs; the words *tārīsa-*, *etārīsa-*, *yārīsa-*; etc. And there are some special agreements between the dialects of the Girnār, Shāhbāzgarhi, Mansehra redactions of Asoka's Fourteen-Edicts and Pāli as opposed to the 'Māgadhan' dialects of the Asokan inscriptions. For example, the sounds *r*, *ñ*, *ṇ*, *ḷ* (written *l* on inscriptions) as the equivalent of *ly* in Skt. *kalyāṇa-* (G. *kalāṇa-*, Shb., Mans. *kalāṇa-*, Pāli *kallāṇa-*, 'Māgadhan' *kayāṇa-*); the pronoun *ahaṃ* ('Māgadhan' *hakaṃ*); etc. On the other hand, there are some special points of contact between the 'Māgadhan' dialect of the Asokan inscriptions and Pāli. Especially noteworthy is the agreement in the treatment of *r* in conjoint consonants, and the word *hevaṃ* (G., Shb., Mans. *evaṃ*): on this last see Michelson, *IF.* xxiii, 128. But Pāli has also one special agreement with the dialect of the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra redactions of the Fourteen-Edicts and the dialect of the Siddhāpura-Edicts of Asoka as compared with other dialects of the Asokan inscriptions, namely, the transfer of original *r*-stems to *u*-stems. Two things are certain, namely, that Pāli is a literary language only and does not represent any one spoken vernacular, and that whatever dialect forms the basis of the written language, that dialect does not coincide exactly with any one of the dialects of the inscriptions of Asoka: compare Windisch in his essay on Pāli in the Transactions of the International Congress of Orientalists held at Algiers, and Michelson, *AJP.* xxx, 287, 297.

is this: *punya-* goes back to **pṛṇya-*; **pṛṇya-* is derived from **pṛṇa-* by means of the suffix *ya-*.¹ Now **pṛṇa-* might have a young analogical doublet **pṛna-* with dental *n*. From **pṛna-* **pṛnya-* would be derived exactly as **pṛṇya-* from **pṛṇa-*. From **pṛṇya-*, Gīrnār *pumṇam* comes without difficulty; for *ny* becomes *ṇṇ* (written *mṇ*) in this dialect; see above.

¹ On the suffix *nya-*, assumed by Meillet and Brugmann, see Bartholomae, l.c. Even if *nya-* (which phonetically would become *ṇya-* in the present instance) were correct, that would only necessitate shifting our ground in small degree: for *nya-* could be replaced by *ṇya-* as easily as *ṇa-* by *na-*.